

Application No.:10/517,839
Art Unit 2834

Attorney Docket No. 3449-0418P
Reply to November 17, 2005 Office Action
Page 9

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application.

Claims 1-19 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 7, 13 and 18 are independent.

Amendments have been made to the specification, claims 1, 7, 13 and 18 have been amended. No new matter is involved.

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

Information Disclosure Citation

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the existence of the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on December 15, 2004. The Office Action indicates that legible copies of the references cited in that IDS were not

Application No.:10/517,839
Art Unit 2834

Attorney Docket No. 3449-0418P
Reply to November 17, 2005 Office Action
Page 10

provided by the International Bureau (IB) in connection with the parent PCT application (PCT/KR2003/001444).

In the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant is attaching a copy of all four patent documents cited in that IDS. Moreover, for the convenience of the Examiner, computer-generated English language translations of the three cited Japanese patent publications are also included.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide Applicant with an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form.

Specification Amendment

Applicant has amended the specification in order to correct a minor typographical error on page 3 of the specification.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-11, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over either JP-12092804 or JP-14028570 in view of U.S. Patent 6,765,331 to Koyanagi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

Claims 1, 7 and 18, as amended, clearly patentably define over the applied art. None of the three applied references disclose the positively recited features of claims 1-11, 18 and 19. Claims 1 and 7 recite a combination of features including a rotator in which the coil is placed that covers all of the back side and outer circumference of the coil, and claim 18 recites a combination of features including a rotator placed upon a circumference of the rotational shaft to accept a coil so that the coil is not exposed except at the bottom side of the coil, and a coil received in the rotator so that the coil is not exposed to exterior except at the bottom side of the coil. None of the applied references disclose or suggest such a combination of features. In this regard, the Office Action effectively admits that such features are not disclosed by either of the two applied Japanese Published patent applications (JP '570 or JP '804).

Additionally, the rotor R disclosed in Koyanagi's Fig. 7, which forms the basis for the rejection of these claims, has a rotor base 1 that does not cover all of the top and sides of the coils, as recited.

Accordingly, even if it were obvious to modify either of the applied Japanese patent publications, the resulting modified version of either one would neither disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claims 1-11, 18 and 19 are respectfully requested.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over the art applied in the rejection of claim 7 (from which claim 12 depends) in view of U.S. Patent 6,359,364 to Yamaguchi et al. ("Yamaguchi"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, Applicant notes that claim 7, from which claim 12 depends, patentably defines over the art applied in the rejection of claim 7, for reasons stated above. Moreover, Yamaguchi is not being applied to remedy the deficiencies noted above with respect to the art applied in the rejection of claim 7.

Accordingly, even if it were obvious to modify the art applied in the rejection of claim 7, the resulting modified version of that art would neither disclose or suggest the invention recited in claim 12.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claim 12 are respectfully requested.

Claims 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over either JP-12092804 or JP-14028570 in view of Koyanagi and Yamaguchi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

Claims 13-17, as amended, clearly patentably define over the applied art.

None of the four applied references disclose the positively recited features of claims 13-17. Independent claim 13 recites a combination of features including a rotator inserted onto the rotational shaft and formed of base made of resin, for rotating, that covers all of the back side and outer circumference of the coil.

None of the applied references disclose or suggest such a combination of features. In this regard, the Office Action effectively admits that such features are not disclosed by either of the two applied Japanese Published patent applications (JP '570 or JP '804), or by Yamaguchi.

Additionally, the rotor R disclosed in Koyanagi's Fig. 7, which forms part of the basis for the rejection of these claims, has a rotor base 1 that does not cover all of the top and sides of the coils, as recited.

Accordingly, even if it were obvious to modify either of the applied Japanese patent publications in view of the secondary references to Koyanagi and Yamaguchi, the resulting modified version of either one would neither disclose nor suggest the claimed invention.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claims 13-17 are respectfully requested.

Claims 20-23

Claims 20-23 have been added for the Examiner's consideration. Applicant submits that claims 20-23 depend, respectively, from independent claims 1, 7 and 13 and are therefore allowable based on their dependence from those claims, which are believed to be allowable for reasons discussed, above.

Support for this feature is found in Applicant's originally filed disclosure, which clearly illustrates, in Figs. 3, 4 and 5, that rotor 71 or 81 is a single piece.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the applied references disclose a single piece rotor structure.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone

Application No.:10/517,839
Art Unit 2834

Attorney Docket No. 3449-0418P
Reply to November 17, 2005 Office Action
Page 15

Robert J. Webster, Registration No. 46,472, at (703) 205-8000, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By: SLT/LJL

Scott L. Lowe
Reg. No.: 41,458

SLL/RJW:gf
[Signature]

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
Telephone: (703)205-8000

Attachment: Additional Copies of References cited in the IDS filed December 15, 2004, and three English language translations from the JPO